

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 BOBBY WOLFORD TRUCKING &
13 SALVAGE, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

C18-747 TSZ

MINUTE ORDER

14 The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable
15 Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge:

16 (1) The motion to exclude the expert testimony of Mark Buckley, Ph.D.
17 brought by defendant Bobby Wolford Trucking & Salvage, Inc. (“BWT”), pursuant to
18 *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993), docket no. 30, is DENIED.
19 Defendant’s motion does not challenge the credentials of Dr. Buckley; rather, it
20 challenges solely the methodology used by Dr. Buckley. *See* Motion at 7 (docket no. 30).
21 Dr. Buckley has analyzed two of the statutory factors relevant to the determination of a
22 civil penalty under the Clean Water Act (“CWA”). *See* 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d). Defendant
23 contends that the CWA “requires” an expert to examine all six factors and, as a result,
Dr. Buckley’s expert report “fails to comport with the law.” Motion at 10. Defendant’s
contention is without merit. In support of the United States’ claim for a civil penalty,
Dr. Buckley has analyzed the two factors that involve questions of economics, to wit:
the economic benefit, if any, BWT obtained (factor 2) and the economic impact of a
penalty on BWT (factor 5). Dr. Buckley analyzed these two economic factors using a
reliable method consistently applied. If BWT disagrees with the analysis, vigorous cross-

1 examination and presentation of contrary evidence is available to BWT to challenge
2 Dr. Buckley's conclusions.¹ See Daubert, 509 U.S. at 596.²

3 (2) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Minute Order to all counsel of
4 record.

5 Dated this 4th day of November, 2019.

6 William M. McCool
7 Clerk

8 s/Karen Dews
9 Deputy Clerk

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 ¹ BWT's suggestion that Dr. Buckley was also required to consider the EPA's Policy on
20 Civil Penalties is without merit. That document is only a guide in connection with settlement
under the CWA and the Government is not bound by it. United States v. City of Evansville, Ind.,
2011 WL 2470670 at *6 (S.D. Ind. June 20, 2011).

21 ² The Court has also considered the Government's challenge to the late disclosure of
22 Dr. Dunford's expert report dated June 21, 2019, and concludes that the report, Ex. C to Hansen
23 Decl. (docket no. 38), will be considered by the Court but it does not support BWT's motion to
exclude Dr. Buckley's testimony.